



JEFFERSON PARK EXPANSION
PROJECT ADVISORY TEAM MEETING #1
Thursday, September 15, 2005
Jefferson Community Center

MEETING SUMMARY

PAT Members Present: Shellwyn Badger Bruce Bentley
Bert Caoili Mike Carney
Monique Cherrier Steve Galey
Nancy Spurgeon Stuart McFeely

PAT Members Absent: Mira Latoszek

Other attendees: Randy Robinson, Project Manager; Randy Smith, Jefferson Community Center Coordinator; Willie Weir, Jefferson Park Alliance; Greg Brower, The Berger Partnership; J.B. Dennison, Wash. Dept. of Ecology

Meeting Facilitator: Cheryl Fraser, Parks Southeast Operations Manager

Welcome: Each member of the PAT, Parks staff, and guests introduced themselves and the organizations that they are affiliated with.

Role of PAT: Cheryl gave an overview of the role of the PAT, as directed by Parks Superintendent Ken Bounds: the goal is to discuss the new park development plans and prioritize the elements. The PAT members should report back to their constituent community as the park design progresses. The ground rules for conduct for PAT meetings was read by Cheryl. Randy said that the ground rules would be printed on the back of the next agenda.

Previous Meeting Notes: None.

Project Overview Randy R. gave a brief overview of the history of Jefferson Park and the recent history of Parks Department projects at the park, including this one. The current project: Jefferson Park Expansion – Phase I has a budget of \$7.3 million for planning, design and construction of the park improvements. The schedule was outlined as: schematic design – summer/fall 2005, design Development – winter/spring 2006, Construction Documents – summer/fall/winter 2006, Construction Stage One – 2007, Construction Stage Two – 2008. The Jefferson Park Site Plan of 2002 was introduced with the commitment to stay as close to that plan as is possible considering all of the years of work that went into it.

Discussion: **Greg:** Greg started the discussion with a review of the 2002 Plan, pointing out the main elements of the plan including: utilities, buildings, play fields, promenade, etc. He passed out a list of these main elements of the project for further discussion (see appendix). The elements represent about \$30 million in improvements. Parks and The Berger Partnership have had to make some assumptions about what could be built as part of this project's

Discussion (cont.):

phase and what elements would have to be left for future funding to support. Greg showed graphic exhibits that displayed how the site divided up between what was 1.) not in our project at all (ie. golf, horticulture facility, fire station, etc.), 2.) elements that are in the project design area but probably not able to be funded with the current funds, 3.) elements in our project and potentially funded by the project.

Mike: What about Mercer Middle School kids? – what about the track? It looks like the track may not be funded?

Greg: Maybe a method could be devised to measure a distance on a path that could be used for running – 400m, 800m, etc.

Mike: The track keeps kids visible to the teacher or coach, helps them burn off excess energy.

Randy S.: The community center kids need a track. Cleveland track in no good.

Monique: What have been the priorities? The pathways at Green Lake are used by pedestrians and bikes and skaters.

Randy S.: What about an inexpensive track?

Randy R.: The costs can be discussed at the next meeting. We were trying to prioritize elements of the project at this meeting.

Greg: The “level of finish” will determine largely what elements will cost.

Steve: Soccer is a greater need than baseball. If need be the level of finish for baseball could be less than soccer. But building two baseball fields is always preferable to building just one.

Willie: We shouldn't build parts of this project in substandard surfaces - lets do it right.

Greg: The North Meadow has space for small soccer practice fields also.

Stuart: Cricket needs more space.

Some discussion ensued concerning the size requirements for Cricket.

Mike: Is the play area going to get smaller – it looks smaller on the plan.

Randy R.: The square footage is the same, but not spread out.

Randy S.: Maybe the play area could be more visible, not behind the CC.

Nancy: The play area's relationship to the golf driving range should be taken into consideration.

Willie: Yes, safety is a concern for play area location. The farther away from the driving range the better.

Greg: The new driving range fence is going to be 120 feet high.

Stuart: The decisions from the previous plan did not have complete support of everyone. Some wanted the play area to the north of the tennis courts.

Willie: The play area was moved (on the 2002 Site Plan) away from Beacon Ave. because parents didn't want it next to the busy 4-lane traffic; that situation has changed.

Nancy: likes the current location of the play area.

Greg: There looks like 3 issues with the play area: 1) sight lines from the CC, 2) golf balls, 3) utilities around the CC.

Randy: We can work on siting of the play area and other elements farther into design. Let's touch on some of the other elements.

Mike: As an engineer...water features can be expensive.

Greg: Water feature could be based on storm water only.

Randy S.: Water feature intention was always storm water.

Nancy: Water should be related to what happens in nature.

Shellwyn: The skate park should be included.

Cheryl: Southeast Seattle needs a skate park.

Discussion (cont.):

Monique: What is the goal tonight?

Randy: To prioritize what elements are most important to the community.

Bert: the 2002 Plan shouldn't be changed by every different committee that works on it – the plan would be constantly changing.

Several people agreed with that point.

Willie: The water feature is nice but could be in a later phase.

Bert: Retention pond for seasonal run-off is needed.

Shellwyn: Can things be interchanged like a menu. Maybe the skateboard park is the same price as the water feature and can be included if the water feature is out.

Mike: Kids won't want to use water feature during the rainy months.

Randy S.: In the previous planning (2001-02) people liked the image of the "big lake" out there (the north reservoir) but couldn't get to the "lake" because of the fencing. They wanted to keep that image. Maybe water feature could just be smaller.

Cheryl: So it looks like we need some costs. Skate park costs? Track costs? Path materials?

Randy/Greg: We can provide costs for next the meeting.

Stuart: Infrastructure should be considered in stage one. Maybe the skate park can't move up the list just because one person likes it. Maybe costs can't accommodate it.

Randy: One more thing about costs is the very real possibility that the only kind of sports field that we may be able to build over a water reservoir is a synthetic field and that may require a big chunk of the budget.

Bruce: Generally, we try to provide lights at synthetic fields.

Randy: Field lights were never identified as a feature at Jefferson.

Mike: Don't demolish the existing play area before we build a new one.

Bruce: supports the skate park also.

Conclusion:

Cheryl concluded the meeting by thanking everyone and reminding that the public meeting was on September 29th and that PAT members are encouraged to attend. Parks will send out some cost information ahead of the next meeting for everyone to think about.

Next meeting:

The next PAT meeting will be October 20th, 2005 at 6:30 at Jefferson Lawn Bowling, but we will be meeting at 6:00 pm for a site tour.

Handouts:

Jefferson Park Expansion preliminary list of elements (2 pages).

Additional Information is Available:

- Park web site: <http://www.cityofseattle.net/parks/proparks/projects/jeffersonparkexpansion.htm>
- Randy Robinson, Seattle Parks Project Manager, (206) 684-7035; randy.robinson@seattle.gov
- Cheryl Fraser, Parks Resources Manager, (206) 684-8016; cheryl.fraser@seattle.gov